arXiv:1302.4153v1 [math.CO] 18 Feb 2013

FIRST ORDER DEFORMATIONS OF THE FOURIER MATRIX

TEODOR BANICA

Abstract. The $N\times N$ complex Hadamard matrices form a real algebraic manifold C_N. The singularity at a point $H\in C_N$ is described by a filtration of cones $T_H^\times C_N\subset T_H^\circ C_N\subset T_HC_N\subset\widetilde{T}_HC_N$, coming from the trivial, affine, smooth and first order deformations. We investigate here these cones in the case where $H=F_N$ is the Fourier matrix, $H_{ij}=w^{ij}$ with $w=e^{2\pi i/N}$. Our main result is a simple description of the enveloping tangent space $\widetilde{T}_HC_N$, with the corresponding vectors appearing as plain sums of certain variables.

Contents

Introduction 1
1. Hadamard matrices 4
2. The defect, revisited 10
3. Tensor product gluing 15
4. Fourier matrices 20
5. The general case 25
6. Probabilistic aspects 28
References 32

Introduction

An Hadamard matrix is a square matrix $H\in M_N(\pm 1)$, whose rows are pairwise orthogonal. The size of such a matrix must be $N=2$ or $N\in 4\mathbb{N}$, and the celebrated Hadamard Conjecture (HC) states that for any $N\in 4\mathbb{N}$, there exists an Hadamard matrix of order N. Also famous is the Circulant Hadamard Conjecture (CHC), stating that the only examples of circulant Hadamard matrices can appear at $N=4$. We refer to the monographs [18], [26] for a discussion of these key problems.

There are several interesting generalizations of the Hadamard matrices, see [4]. We will be interested here in the complex Hadamard matrices: the square matrices $H\in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ whose entries are on the unit circle, $|H_{ij}|=1$, and whose rows are pairwise orthogonal.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05B20 (14B05, 46L37).

Key words and phrases. Complex Hadamard matrix, Fourier matrix.

The basic example of such a matrix is the Fourier one, $F_N = (w^{ij})$ with $w = e^{2\pi i/N}$:

$$F_N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \ldots & 1 \\ 1 & w & w^2 & \ldots & w^{N-1} \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ 1 & w^{N-1} & w^{2(N-1)} & \ldots & w^{(N-1)^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

In general, the theory of complex Hadamard matrices can be regarded as a "non-standard" branch of discrete Fourier analysis. As an example of what can be done with the help of such a matrix, we refer for instance to Tao's paper [38]. For some other potential applications, mainly to quantum physics questions, see [7], [36], [40].

The complex Hadamard matrices have as well deep connections with von Neumann algebras, subfactor theory, knot invariants, spin models, planar algebras, quantum groups and free probability theory. See [2], [17], [19], [20], [21], [28], [32].

One key problem in the area, raised by Jones in [20], concerns the computation of the numbers $c_k = \dim P_k$, where $P = (P_k)$ is the planar algebra associated to H. These numbers, called quantum invariants of H, are in general extremely hard to compute. Very little is known about them, and only a few results, conjectures, or even clear questions regarding them are available, see [2], [9], [20], [31]. In particular, we have:

Problem. *What is the relation between the quantum invariants of H, and the geometry of the complex Hadamard matrix manifold around H?*

In order to further comment on this problem, let us recall what the known results on the complex Hadamard matrix manifold C_N are. First, this manifold is given by:

$$C_N = M_N(\mathbb{T}) \cap \sqrt{N} U_N$$

Thus, C_N is an intersection of real algebraic smooth manifolds, so it is a real algebraic manifold, not smooth in general. The results about it can be divided into four classes:

1. Local structure. The main problem here is of course to describe the singularity of C_N at a given point $H \in C_N$. See [1], [5], [36], [37].
2. Global structure. At $N \leq 5$ we only have the matrix F_N and its deformations, as shown in [15]. The structure of C_6 is not known, see [2], [6], [23], [34].
3. Rational points. These were introduced by Butson in [10]. The main problem here is to formulate an analogue of the HC. See [2], [24], [25].
4. Circulant points. These were introduced by Björck in [8]. The main problem here is to formulate the correct extension of the CHC. See [3], [16], [27].

The present paper mainly belongs to the first direction mentioned above. We will first perform some axiomatization work, by introducing the following filtration of cones:

$$T_H^\times C_N \subset T_H^\circ C_N \subset T_H C_N \subset \widetilde{T}_H C_N$$

Here $T_H C_N$ is the tangent cone, and $T_H^\circ C_N$ is the affine tangent cone, obtained by restricting attention to the affine deformations. These cones live in the enveloping tangent space $\widetilde{T}_HC_N$, obtained by interesecting the tangent spaces to the smooth manifolds $M_N(\mathbb{T})$ and $\sqrt{N}U_N$, and contain the trivial tangent cone $T_H^\times C_N$, consisting of vectors which are tangent to the trivial deformations, obtained by multiplying rows and columns.

In general, the computation of these cones is a quite difficult linear algebra problem. In the Fourier matrix case, however, we have the following key formula:

$$\dim(\widetilde{T}_HC_N)=\#\{(i,j)|H_{ij}=1\}$$

This result was established by Tadej and Życzkowski in [37], with parts of it going back to Karabegov's paper [22], and with the general case discussed in detail in [1].

In this paper, following a number of supplementary ideas from [5], [13], [36], we will obtain a finer result about $H=F_N$, directly in terms of $\widetilde{T}_HC_N$:

Theorem. *For $H=F_N$ the vectors $A\in\widetilde{T}_HC_N$ appear as plain sums of type*

$$A_{ij}=\sum_{G\times H\subset\mathbb{Z}_N}L^{GH}_{\varphi_G(i)\varphi_H(j)}$$

where the L variables are free, and form dephased matrices $L^{GH}\in M_{G\times H}(\mathbb{R})$.

We refer to section 5 below for the precise formulation of this result, which requires a number of preliminaries, not to be explained in detail right now.

Let us go back now to the quantum algebra/algebraic geometry problem formulated above. This problem was recently investigated in [1], with a proposal there involving Diaconis-Shahshahani type variables [12]. The various results obtained here, which substantially refine those in [1], suggest an upgrade of the whole discussion, as follows:

Question. *What algebraic and geometric invariants of H are encoded by the statistics of the number of 1 entries, over the equivalence class of H?*

More precisely, consider for instance a usual Hadamard matrix, $H\in M_N(\pm1)$. This matrix is of course described by the set of indices $E\subset\{1,\ldots,N\}\times\{1,\ldots,N\}$ telling us where the 1 entries are. What we propose here is a more geometric approach to H, by considering the function $\varphi:\mathbb{Z}_2^N\times\mathbb{Z}_2^N\to\mathbb{N}$ which counts the number of 1 entries of the various conjugates of H, obtained by switching signs on rows and columns:

$$\varphi(a,b)=\#\{(i,j)|a_ib_jH_{ij}=1\}$$

This construction can be generalized to the Butson matrices, and our claim is that φ, or just its probabilistic distribution μ, should encode important information about H.

In general, the computation of μ is a difficult problem. In the real case, this is related to the Gale-Berlekamp game [14], [33] and to various questions regarding the 0-1 matrices, cf. [11], [29], [39]. We intend to come back to these questions in some future work.

The paper is organized as follows: 1-2 are preliminary sections, containing as well a number of new results, in 3-4 we state and prove some technical results, and 5-6 contain the main result, the probabilistic speculations, and a few concluding remarks.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Ingemar Bengtsson, Alexander Karabegov, Ion Nechita, Joseph O'Rourke, Gerhard Paseman, Patrick Popescu-Pampu, Jean-Marc Schlenker, Ferenc Szöllősi and Karol Życzkowski for several useful discussions.

1. HADAMARD MATRICES

We consider in this paper various square matrices over the complex numbers, $H \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$. The indices of our matrices will usually range in the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, N-1\}$.

Definition 1.1. *A complex Hadamard matrix is a matrix $H \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ whose entries are on the unit circle, $|H_{ij}| = 1$, and whose rows are pairwise orthogonal.*

It follows from linear algebra that the columns of H are pairwise orthogonal as well. In fact, a matrix $H \in M_N(\mathbb{T})$ is Hadamard if and only if $U = H/\sqrt{N}$ is unitary.

The basic example is the Fourier matrix $F_N = (w^{ij})$, with $w = e^{2\pi i/N}$. In matrix notation, and by using the above convention for the indices, we have:

$$F_N = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \ldots & 1 \\ 1 & w & w^2 & \ldots & w^{N-1} \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ 1 & w^{N-1} & w^{2(N-1)} & \ldots & w^{(N-1)^2} \end{pmatrix}$$

There are many other complex Hadamard matrices, see [36]. One simple way of constructing new examples is by taking tensor products, $(H \otimes K)_{ia,jb} = H_{ij}K_{ab}$.

Observe that the above matrix F_N is nothing but the matrix of the discrete Fourier transform, over the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}_N$. In fact, we have the following result:

Proposition 1.2. *The Fourier matrix of a finite abelian group $G = \mathbb{Z}_{N_1} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{Z}_{N_k}$ is the complex Hadamard matrix $F_G = F_{N_1} \otimes \ldots \otimes F_{N_k}$.*

Proof. For a product of groups $G = G' \times G''$ we have $F_G = F_{G'} \otimes F_{G''}$, and together with the above observation regarding F_N, this gives the equality in the statement. □

As an example, for the Klein group $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ we obtain the following matrix:

$$F_2 \otimes F_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

The following notions will play a key role in what follows:

Definition 1.3. *Let $H, K \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ be two complex Hadamard matrices.*

1. *H is called dephased if its first row and column consist of 1 entries only.*
2. *H, K are called equivalent if one can pass from one to the other by permuting rows and columns, or by multiplying the rows and columns by numbers in $\mathbb{T}$.*

In other words, we use the equivalence relation on the $N\times N$ matrices coming from the action $T_{(A,B)}(H)=AHB^*$ of the group $G=((S_N\rtimes\mathbb{T})\times(S_N\rtimes\mathbb{T}))/\mathbb{T}$. Observe that any complex Hadamard matrix can be assumed, up to equivalence, to be dephased.

We know from Proposition 1.2 that the class of Fourier matrices is closed under tensor products. In order to escape from it, we can use deformations. As a basic example, given a matrix $Q\in M_2(\mathbb{T})$, written $Q=\left(\begin{smallmatrix}a&b\\c&d\end{smallmatrix}\right)$, we can form the following matrix:

$$F_2\,{}_Q\!\otimes F_2=\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{pmatrix}\,{}_{\begin{pmatrix}a&b\\c&d\end{pmatrix}}\!\otimes\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}a&a&b&b\\c&-c&d&-d\\a&a&-b&-b\\c&-c&-d&d\end{pmatrix}$$

With the same data in hand, we can form as well the following matrix:

$$F_2\otimes_Q F_2=\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{pmatrix}\otimes_{\begin{pmatrix}a&b\\c&d\end{pmatrix}}\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}a&b&a&b\\a&-b&a&-b\\c&d&-c&-d\\c&-d&-c&d\end{pmatrix}$$

Observe that the above two matrices are indeed Hadamard. In fact, these matrices appear as particular cases of the following general construction, due to Diţă [13]:

Proposition 1.4. *If $H\in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ and $K\in M_M(\mathbb{C})$ are Hadamard, then so are:*

1. $H\,{}_Q\!\otimes K=(Q_{aj}H_{ij}K_{ab})_{ia,jb}$, *with* $Q\in M_{M\times N}(\mathbb{T})$.
2. $H\otimes_Q K=(Q_{ib}H_{ij}K_{ab})_{ia,jb}$, *with* $Q\in M_{N\times M}(\mathbb{T})$.

These two matrices will be called left and right Diţă deformations of $H\otimes K$.

Proof. If we denote by R^1_{ia} the ia-th row of $H\,{}_Q\!\otimes K$, we have:

$$<R^1_{ia},R^1_{kc}>=\sum_{jb}Q_{aj}H_{ij}K_{ab}\cdot\bar{Q}_{cj}\bar{H}_{kj}\bar{K}_{cb}=M\delta_{ac}\sum_j H_{ij}\bar{H}_{kj}=MN\delta_{ac}\delta_{ik}$$

Also, if we denote by R^2_{ia} the ia-th row of $H\otimes_Q K$, we have:

$$<R^2_{ia},R^2_{kc}>=\sum_{jb}Q_{ib}H_{ij}K_{ab}\cdot\bar{Q}_{kb}\bar{H}_{kj}\bar{K}_{cb}=N\delta_{ik}\sum_b K_{ab}\bar{K}_{cb}=NM\delta_{ik}\delta_{ac}$$

Thus in both cases we have $<R_{ia},R_{kc}>=NM\delta_{ia,kc}$, which gives the result. □

Let us take now a closer look at all the above examples of complex Hadamard matrices. We can see that the roots of unity often play a key role, and we have:

Definition 1.5. *A complex Hadamard matrix $H\in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is called:*

1. *Of Buston type, if all its entries are roots of unity, of a given order $s<\infty$.*
2. *Regular, if all scalar products between rows decompose as sums of cycles.*

Here by "cycle" we mean a full sum of roots of unity, possibly rotated by a scalar:

$$C=\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda e^{2k\pi i/n}$$

As a basic example, all the Fourier matrices are of Butson type, and their Diţă deformations are regular. One interest in the above notions comes from the fact that the regular complex Hadamard matrices can be fully classified up to $N=6$. See [2].

In general, the regularity condition is Definition 1.5 is quite poorly understood:

Conjecture 1.6 (Regularity)**.** *Any Butson matrix is regular.*

More precisely, for exponents of type $s=p^a$ or $s=p^aq^b$ one can prove that any vanishing sum of s-roots of unity decomposes a sum of cycles, but this is not true in general. See [24]. Here is actually the simplest counterexample, with $w=e^{2\pi i/30}$:

$$w^5+w^6+w^{12}+w^{18}+w^{24}+w^{25}=0$$

So, what Conjecture 1.6 says is that such a "tricky sum" cannot be used for constructing a complex Hadamard matrix. We refer to [2] for further details on this conjecture.

Let C_N be the real algebraic manifold formed by the $N\times N$ complex Hadamard matrices. We denote by M_x an unspecified neighborhood of a point in a manifold, $x\in M$. Also, for $q\in\mathbb{T}_1$, meaning that $q\in\mathbb{T}$ is close to 1, we define q^r with $r\in\mathbb{R}$ by $(e^{it})^r=e^{itr}$.

Proposition 1.7. *For $H\in C_N$ and $A\in M_N(\mathbb{R})$, the following are equivalent:*

1. *$H^q_{ij}=H_{ij}q^{A_{ij}}$ is an Hadamard matrix, for any $q\in\mathbb{T}_1$.*
2. *$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}q^{A_{ik}-A_{jk}}=0$, for any $i\neq j$ and any $q\in\mathbb{T}_1$.*
3. *$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}\varphi(A_{ik}-A_{jk})=0$, for any $i\neq j$ and any $\varphi:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}$.*
4. *$\sum_{k\in E^r_{ij}} H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}=0$ for any $i\neq j$ and $r\in\mathbb{R}$, where $E^r_{ij}=\{k|A_{ik}-A_{jk}=r\}$.*

Proof. All the equivalences are elementary, and can be proved as follows:

(1) $\iff$ (2) Indeed, the scalar products between the rows of H^q are:

$$<H^q_i,H^q_j>=\sum_k H_{ik}q^{A_{ik}}\bar{H}_{jk}\bar{q}^{A_{jk}}=\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}q^{A_{ik}-A_{jk}}$$

(2) $\implies$ (4) This follows from the following formula, and from the fact that the power functions $\{q^r|r\in\mathbb{R}\}$ over the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$ are linearly independent:

$$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}q^{A_{ik}-A_{jk}}=\sum_{r\in\mathbb{R}}q^r\sum_{k\in E^r_{ij}}H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}$$

(4) $\implies$ (3) This follows from the following formula:

$$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}\varphi(A_{ik}-A_{jk})=\sum_{r\in\mathbb{R}}\varphi(r)\sum_{k\in E^r_{ij}}H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}$$

(3) $\implies$ (2) This simply follows by taking $\varphi(r)=q^r$. □

Observe that in the above statement the condition (4) is purely combinatorial.

In order to understand the above type of deformations, it is convenient to enlarge attention to all types of deformations. We keep using the neighborhood notation M_x introduced above, and we consider functions of type $f : M_x \to N_y$, which by definition satisfy $f(x) = y$. With these conventions, we introduce the following notions:

Definition 1.8. *Let $H \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ be a complex Hadamard matrix.*

1. *A deformation of H is a smooth function $f : \mathbb{T}_1 \to (C_N)_H$.*
2. *The deformation is called "affine" if $f_{ij}(q) = H_{ij}q^{A_{ij}}$, with $A \in M_N(\mathbb{R})$.*
3. *We call "trivial" the deformations of type $f_{ij}(q) = H_{ij}q^{a_i+b_j}$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^N$.*

Here the adjective "affine" comes from $f_{ij}(e^{it}) = H_{ij}e^{iA_{ij}t}$, because the function $t \to A_{ij}t$ which produces the exponent is indeed affine. As for the adjective "trivial", this comes from the fact that $f(q) = (H_{ij}q^{a_i+b_j})_{ij}$ is obtained from H by multiplying the rows and columns by certain numbers in $\mathbb{T}$, so it is automatically Hadamard. See [36].

The basic example of an affine deformation comes from the Diţă deformations $H \otimes_Q K$, by taking all parameters $q_{ij} \in \mathbb{T}$ to be powers of $q \in \mathbb{T}$. As an example, here are the exponent matrices coming from the left and right Diţă deformations of $F_2 \otimes F_2$:

$$A_l = \begin{pmatrix} a & a & b & b \\ c & c & d & d \\ a & a & b & b \\ c & c & d & d \end{pmatrix} \qquad A_r = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & a & b \\ a & b & a & b \\ c & d & c & d \\ c & d & c & d \end{pmatrix}$$

In order to investigate the above types of deformations, we will of course use the corresponding tangent vectors. So, let us first recall that the manifold C_N is given by:

$$C_N = M_N(\mathbb{T}) \cap \sqrt{N}U_N$$

This observation leads to the following definitions, where in the first part we denote by T_xM the tangent space to a point in a smooth manifold, $x \in M$:

Definition 1.9. *Associated to a point $H \in C_N$ are the following objects:*

1. *The enveloping tangent space: $\widetilde{T}_HC_N = T_HM_N(\mathbb{T}) \cap T_H\sqrt{N}U_N$.*
2. *The tangent cone T_HC_N: the set of tangent vectors to the deformations of H.*
3. *The affine tangent cone $T_H^\circ C_N$: same as above, using affine deformations only.*
4. *The trivial tangent cone $T_H^\times C_N$: as above, using trivial deformations only.*

Observe that $\widetilde{T}_HC_N, T_H^\times C_N$ are real linear spaces, and that $T_HC_N, T_H^\circ C_N$ are two-sided cones, in the sense that they satisfy $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}, A \in T \implies \lambda A \in T$.

Observe also that we have inclusions of cones, as follows:

$$T_H^\times C_N \subset T_H^\circ C_N \subset T_HC_N \subset \widetilde{T}_HC_N$$

In more algebraic terms now, the above tangent cones are best described by the corresponding matrices, as follows:

Theorem 1.10. *The cones $T_H^\times C_N\subset T_H^\circ C_N\subset T_HC_N\subset\widetilde{T}_HC_N$ are as follows:*

1. *$\widetilde{T}_HC_N$ can be identified with the linear space formed by the matrices $A\in M_N(\mathbb R)$ satisfying $\sum_kH_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}(A_{ik}-A_{jk})=0$, for any i,j.*
2. *T_HC_N consists of those matrices $A\in M_N(\mathbb R)$ appearing as $A_{ij}=g_{ij}'(0)$, where $g:M_N(\mathbb R)_0\to M_N(\mathbb R)_0$ satisfies $\sum_kH_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}e^{i(g_{ik}(t)-g_{jk}(t))}=0$ for any i,j.*
3. *$T_H^\circ C_N$ is formed by the matrices $A\in M_N(\mathbb R)$ satisfying $\sum_kH_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}q^{A_{ik}-A_{jk}}=0$, for any $i\neq j$ and any $q\in\mathbb T$.*
4. *$T_H^\times C_N$ is formed by the matrices $A\in M_N(\mathbb R)$ which are of the form $A_{ij}=a_i+b_j$, for certain vectors $a,b\in\mathbb R^N$.*

Proof. All these assertions can be deduced by using basic differential geometry:

(1) This result is from [1], the idea being as follows. First, $M_N(\mathbb T)$ is defined by the algebraic relations $|H_{ij}|^2=1$, and with $H_{ij}=X_{ij}+iY_{ij}$ we have:

$$d|H_{ij}|^2=d(X_{ij}^2+Y_{ij}^2)=2(X_{ij}\dot{X}_{ij}+Y_{ij}\dot{Y}_{ij})$$

Now since an arbitrary vector $\xi\in T_HM_N(\mathbb C)$, written as $\xi=\sum_{ij}\alpha_{ij}\dot{X}_{ij}+\beta_{ij}\dot{Y}_{ij}$, belongs to $T_HM_N(\mathbb T)$ if and only if $<\xi,d|H_{ij}|^2>=0$ for any i,j, we obtain:

$$T_HM_N(\mathbb T)=\left\{\sum_{ij}A_{ij}(Y_{ij}\dot{X}_{ij}-X_{ij}\dot{Y}_{ij})\Big|A_{ij}\in\mathbb R\right\}$$

We also know that $\sqrt{N}U_N$ is defined by the algebraic relations $<H_i,H_j>=N\delta_{ij}$, where $H_1,\ldots,H_N$ are the rows of H. The relations $<H_i,H_i>=N$ being automatic for the matrices $H\in M_N(\mathbb T)$, if for $i\neq j$ we let $L_{ij}=<H_i,H_j>$, then we have:

$$\widetilde{T}_HC_N=\left\{\xi\in T_HM_N(\mathbb T)|<\xi,\dot{L}_{ij}>=0,\forall i\neq j\right\}$$

On the other hand, differentiating the formula of L_{ij} gives:

$$\dot{L}_{ij}=\sum_k(X_{ik}+iY_{ik})(\dot{X}_{jk}-i\dot{Y}_{jk})+(X_{jk}-iY_{jk})(\dot{X}_{ik}+i\dot{Y}_{ik})$$

Now if we pick $\xi\in T_HM_N(\mathbb T)$, written as above in terms of $A\in M_N(\mathbb R)$, we obtain:

$$<\xi,\dot{L}_{ij}>=i\sum_k\bar{H}_{ik}H_{jk}(A_{ik}-A_{jk})$$

Thus we have reached to the description of $\widetilde{T}_HC_N$ in the statement.

(2) Pick an arbitrary deformation, and write it as $f_{ij}(e^{it})=H_{ij}e^{ig_{ij}(t)}$. Observe first that the Hadamard condition corresponds to the equations in the statement, namely:

$$\sum_kH_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}e^{i(g_{ik}(t)-g_{jk}(t))}=0$$

Observe also that by differentiating this formula at $t=0$, we obtain:

$$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}(g'_{ik}(0)-g'_{jk}(0))=0$$

Thus the matrix $A_{ij}=g'_{ij}(0)$ belongs indeed to $\widetilde{T}_HC_N$, so we obtain in this way a certain map $T_HC_N\to\widetilde{T}_HC_N$. In order to check that this map is indeed the correct one, we have to verify that, for any i,j, the tangent vector to our deformation is given by:

$$\xi_{ij}=g'_{ij}(0)(Y_{ij}\dot{X}_{ij}-X_{ij}\dot{Y}_{ij})$$

But this latter verification is just a one-variable problem. So, by dropping all i,j indices (which is the same as assuming $N=1$), we have to check that for any point $H\in\mathbb{T}$, written $H=X+iY$, the tangent vector to the deformation $f(e^{it})=He^{ig(t)}$ is:

$$\xi=g'(0)(Y\dot{X}-X\dot{Y})$$

But this is clear, because the unit tangent vector at $H\in\mathbb{T}$ is $\eta=-i(Y\dot{X}-X\dot{Y})$, and its coefficient coming from the deformation is $(e^{ig(t)})'_{|t=0}=-ig'(0)$.

(3) Observe first that by taking the derivative at $q=1$ of the condition (2) in Proposition 1.7, of just by using the condition (3) there with the function $\varphi(r)=r$, we get:

$$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}\varphi(A_{ik}-A_{jk})=0$$

Thus we have a map $T^\circ_HC_N\to\widetilde{T}_HC_N$, and the fact that is map is indeed the correct one comes for instance from the computation in (2), with $g_{ij}(t)=A_{ij}t$.

(4) Observe first that the Hadamard matrix condition is satisfied:

$$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}q^{A_{ik}-A_{jk}}=q^{a_i-a_j}\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}=\delta_{ij}$$

As for the fact that $T^\times_HC_N$ is indeed the space in the statement, this is clear. □

Let now $D_N\subset C_N$ be the real algebraic manifold formed by all the dephased $N\times N$ complex Hadamard matrices. Observe that we have a quotient map $C_N\to D_N$, obtained by dephasing. With this notation, we have the following refinement of (4) above:

Proposition 1.11. *We have a direct sum decomposition of cones*

$$T^\circ_HC_N=T^\times_HC_N\oplus T^\circ_HD_N$$

where at right we have the affine tangent cone to the dephased manifold $C_N\to D_N$.

Proof. As explained in [1], if we denote by $M^\circ_N(\mathbb{R})$ the set of matrices having 0 outside the first row and column, we have a direct sum decomposition, as follows:

$$\widetilde{T}^\circ_HC_N=M^\circ_N(\mathbb{R})\oplus\widetilde{T}^\circ_HD_N$$

Now by looking at the affine cones, and using Theorem 1.10, this gives the result. □

2. The defect, revisited

The following key definition, whose origins go back to the work of Karabegov [22] and Nicoara [30], was given by Tadej and Życzkowski in [37]:

Definition 2.1. *The defect of a complex Hadamard matrix $H\in C_N$ is the real dimension $d(H)$ of the enveloping tangent space $\widetilde{T}_HC_N=T_HM_N(\mathbb T)\cap T_H\sqrt{N}U_N$.*

We should mention that there are actually several notions of defect, and terminologies for them, see [5], [37]. In what follows we will use the above notation and terminology.

Here are a few basic properties of the defect:

Proposition 2.2. *Let $H\in C_N$ be a complex Hadamard matrix.*

1. *If $H\simeq\widetilde{H}$ then $d(H)=d(\widetilde{H})$.*
2. *We have $2N-1\leq d(H)\leq N^2$.*
3. *If $d(H)=2N-1$, the image of H in the dephased manifold $C_N\to D_N$ is isolated.*

Proof. All these results are well-known, the proof being as follows:

(1) Consider indeed the equations for the enveloping tangent space, namely:

$$\sum_kH_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}(A_{ik}-A_{jk})=0$$

If we let now $K_{ij}=a_ib_jH_{ij}$ with $|a_i|=|b_j|=1$ be a trivial deformation of our matrix H, the equations for the enveloping tangent space for K are:

$$\sum_ka_ib_kH_{ik}\bar{a}_j\bar{b}_k\bar{H}_{jk}(A_{ik}-A_{jk})=0$$

By simplifying we obtain the equations for H, so $d(H)$ is invariant under trivial deformations. Since $d(H)$ is invariant as well by permuting rows or columns, we are done.

(2) Consider the inclusions $T_H^\times C_N\subset T_HC_N\subset\widetilde{T}_HC_N$. Since $\dim(T_H^\times C_N)=2N-1$, the inequality at left holds indeed. As for the inequality at right, this is clear.

(3) In case of equality in the inequality at left in (2), we must have $T_HC_N=T_H^\times C_N$. Thus in case of equality any deformation of H is trivial, and it follows that the image of H in the quotient manifold $C_N\to D_N$ is indeed isolated, as stated. ☐

As a first remark, the upper bound in Proposition 2.2 (2) is of course trivial. We believe that the inequality $d(H)\leq\frac{N(N+1)}{2}$ should hold in general, but we don't have a proof for this fact. We will be back to this issue a bit later, after Theorem 2.6 below.

In the case of Fourier matrices, the computation of the defect is as follows:

Proposition 2.3. *Let F be the Fourier matrix of a group $G=\mathbb Z_{N_1}\times\ldots\mathbb Z_{N_k}$.*

1. *$\widetilde{T}_FC_N=\{PF^*|P_{ij}=P_{i+j,j}=\bar{P}_{i,-j}\}$.*
2. *$d(F)=\sum_{g\in G}[G:<g>]$.*
3. *$d(F)$ is also the number of 1 entries of F.*

Proof. This is basically known from [22], [37], with some slight improvements and generalizations coming from [1], [5], and the proof is as follows:

(1) According to Theorem 1.10 (1), the equations are $\sum_k F_{ik}\bar{F}_{jk}(A_{ik}-A_{jk})=0$. But these equations simply read $(AF)_{i,i-j}-(AF)_{j,i-j}=0$, and together with the fact that $A=(AF)F^*$ must be real, this gives the conditions in the statement. See [1].

(2) The proof here uses an identification of real vector spaces, as follows:

$$\{P\in M_N(\mathbb{C})|P_{ij}=P_{i+j,j}=\bar{P}_{i,-j}\}\simeq\bigoplus_{g\in G}C(G/<g>,\mathbb{R})$$

Indeed, if we let $G_2=\{g\in G|2g=0\}$, and then choose a partition of type $G=G_2\sqcup X\sqcup(-X)$, the formula giving the above identification is $P=\oplus P_g$, with:

$$P_g(i)=\begin{cases}P_{ij} & (j\in G_2)\\ Re(P_{ij}) & (j\in X)\\ Im(P_{ij}) & (j\in -X)\end{cases}$$

With this identification in hand, the result follows from (1).

(3) This observation, from [22], follows from (2), and from the definition of F. □

It is perhaps not obvious from Proposition 2.3 that the matrices $A=PF^*$ constructed in (1) there are real. Here is an equivalent formulation of the result:

Proposition 2.4. *For $F=F_G$, the space $\widetilde{T}_FC_N$ consists of matrices of the form*

$$A_{ik}=Re\left(\sum_f w^{fk}Q_{if}\right)+Im\left(\sum_f w^{fk}R_{if}\right)$$

where $Q,R\in M_G(\mathbb{R})$ satisfy $Q_{ij}=Q_{i+j,j}=Q_{i,-j}$ and $R_{ij}=R_{i+j,j}=-R_{i,-j}$.

Proof. Indeed, let us pick $P\in M_G(\mathbb{C})$, and write it as $P=Q+iR$, with $Q,R\in M_G(\mathbb{R})$. Then the conditions $P_{ij}=P_{i+j,j}=\bar{P}_{i,-j}$ in Proposition 2.3 (1) are equivalent to the conditions on Q,R in the statement, and the matrix $A=PF^*$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}A_{ik} &= i\sum_k w^{-fk}Q_{if}+\sum_f w^{-fk}R_{if}\\ &= -\frac{i}{2}\sum_f(w^{fk}-w^{-fk})Q_{if}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_f(w^{fk}+w^{-fk})R_{if}\end{aligned}$$

But this gives the formula in the statement, and we are done. □

Proposition 2.5. *The defect of basic matrices of type $F=F_G$ is as follows:*

1. *For $G=\mathbb{Z}_N$ with $N=\prod_i p_i^{a_i}$ we have $d(F)=N\prod_i(1+a_i-\frac{a_i}{p_i})$.*
2. *In the Walsh matrix case $G=\mathbb{Z}_2^k$ we have $d(F)=\frac{N(N+1)}{2}$, with $N=2^k$.*

Proof. We use Proposition 2.3, and more specifically the assertion (3) there:

(1) This formula follows indeed from Proposition 2.3. See [37].

(2) Observe first that the matrix in the statement is indeed the k-th Walsh matrix, $W_{2^k} = F_2^{\otimes k}$. We recall now that, according to our tensor product notations:

$$W_{2^k} = \begin{pmatrix} W_{2^{k-1}} & W_{2^{k-1}} \\ W_{2^{k-1}} & -W_{2^{k-1}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Now if we denote by d_k the defect of W_{2^k}, which is the number of 1 entries, then:

$$d_k = 3d_{k-1} + (4^{k-1} - d_{k-1}) = 2d_{k-1} + 4^{k-1}$$

By solving the recurrence we obtain $d_k = 2^{k-1}(2^k + 1)$, which gives the result. $\square$

Let us try now to better understand the formula $d(F) = \frac{N(N+1)}{2}$ found in Proposition 2.5 (2) above. For this purpose, best is to get back to Theorem 1.10 and its proof. Everything there was based on the formula $C_N = M_N(\mathbb{T}) \cap \sqrt{N}U_N$, and more specifically, on the idea of performing all computations inside the space $T_H M_N(\mathbb{T})$. But, we can of course try to perform as well all computations inside the space $T_H \sqrt{N} U_N$.

Let us denote by $M_N(\mathbb{C})^{sa}$ the N^2-dimensional real vector space formed by the complex $N \times N$ matrices which are self-adjoint, in the sense that they satisfy $M = M^*$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $H \in C_N$ be a complex Hadamard matrix.*

1. *We have $\widetilde{T}_H C_N \simeq \{S \in M_N(\mathbb{C})^{sa} | (SH)_{ij}\bar{H}_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}, \forall i, j\}$.*
2. *The correspondence $A \to S$ is given by $S = MH^*$, with $M_{ij} = A_{ij}H_{ij}$.*
3. *For $H = F_G$ we have $\widetilde{T}_F C_N \simeq \{S \in M_G(\mathbb{C})^{sa} | S_{i,i-j} = S_{i+j,i}\}$.*
4. *For Walsh matrices, $H = W_N$ with $N = 2^k$, we have $\widetilde{T}_H C_N = M_N(\mathbb{R})^{symm}$.*

Proof. The idea is that (1,2) follow by carefully rewriting the proof of Theorem 1.10, and that (3,4) are consequences of (1,2). More precisely:

(1) Since $\sqrt{N}U_N$ is defined by $L_{ij} = N\delta_{ij}$, with $L_{ij} =< H_i, H_j >$, we have:

$$T_H \sqrt{N} U_N = \{\xi \in T_H M_N(\mathbb{C}) | < \xi, \dot{L}_{ij} >= 0, \forall i, j\}$$

On the other hand, the derivative of $L_{ij} =< H_i, H_j >$ is given by:

$$\dot{L}_{ij} = \sum_k (X_{ik} + iY_{ik})(\dot{X}_{jk} - i\dot{Y}_{jk}) + (X_{jk} - iY_{jk})(\dot{X}_{ik} + i\dot{Y}_{ik})$$

Now with $\xi \in T_H M_N(\mathbb{C})$, written as $\xi = \sum_i \alpha_i \dot{X}_{ij} + \beta_i \dot{Y}_{ij}$, we have:

$$< \xi, \dot{L}_{ij} >= \sum_k (\alpha_{jk} + i\beta_{jk})(X_{ik} - iY_{ik}) + (\alpha_{ik} - i\beta_{ik})(X_{jk} + iY_{jk})$$

Thus, in terms of the complex numbers $\gamma_{ij} = \alpha_{ij} + i\beta_{ij}$, we obtain:

$$< \xi, \dot{L}_{ij} >= \sum_k \gamma_{jk}\bar{H}_{ik} + \bar{\gamma}_{ik}H_{jk} = (\gamma H^*)_{ji} + \overline{(\gamma H^*)_{ij}}$$

We therefore conclude that for $\xi=\sum_i \alpha_i\dot{X}_{ij}+\beta_i\dot{Y}_{ij}$ as above, we have:

$$\xi\in T_HM_N(\mathbb{C})\iff \gamma H^*\in M_N(\mathbb{C})^{sh}$$

Here $M_N(\mathbb{C})^{sh}$ is the set of $N\times N$ complex matrices which are skew-hermitian, in the sense that they satisfy $M^*=-M$. Now recall from the proof of Theorem 1.10 that we have $\xi\in T_HM_N(\mathbb{T})$ if and only if the following scalar products vanish, for any i,j:

$$<\xi,X_{ij}\dot{X}_{ij}+Y_{ij}\dot{Y}_{ij}>=\alpha_{ij}X_{ij}+\beta_{ij}Y_{ij}=Re((\alpha_{ij}+i\beta_{ij})(X_{ij}-iY_{ij}))=Re(\gamma_{ij}\bar{H}_{ij})$$

Thus we have reached to the following description of the enveloping tangent space:

$$\widetilde{T}_HC_N\simeq\{\gamma\in M_N(\mathbb{C})|\gamma H^*\in M_N(\mathbb{C})^{sh},\gamma_{ij}\bar{H}_{ij}\in i\mathbb{R},\forall i,j\}$$

In terms of the matrices $S=i\gamma H^*$, we therefore obtain, as claimed:

$$\widetilde{T}_HC_N\simeq\{S\in M_N(\mathbb{C})^{sa}|(SH)_{ij}\bar{H}_{ij}\in\mathbb{R},\forall i,j\}$$

(2) Let us pick a matrix $A\in M_N(\mathbb{R})$ as in Theorem 1.10 (1), and consider the associated vector $\xi\in\widetilde{T}_HC_N$, given by $\xi=\sum_{ij}A_{ij}(Y_{ij}\dot{X}_{ij}-X_{ij}\dot{Y}_{ij})$. We have then:

$$Im(\gamma_{ij}\bar{H}_{ij})=\beta_{ij}X_{ij}-\alpha_{ij}Y_{ij}=-A_{ij}X_{ij}^2-A_{ij}Y_{ij}^2=-A_{ij}$$

Thus the bijection $A\to\gamma$ we are looking for is given by $\gamma_{ij}\bar{H}_{ij}=-iA_{ij}$, which reads $\gamma_{ij}=-iA_{ij}H_{ij}$. In terms of the above matrices $S=i\gamma H^*$, this shows that the corresponding bijection $A\to S$ is given by $S=(A_{ij}H_{ij})_{ij}H^*$, and we are done.

(3) Let $P\in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ be as in Proposition 2.3. Then $A=PF^*$ is given by:

$$A_{ij}=(PF^*)_{ij}=\sum_k w^{-kj}P_{ik}$$

Let us compute now the matrices M,S in (2) above. First, we have:

$$M_{ij}=A_{ij}F_{ij}=\sum_k w^{(i-k)j}P_{ik}$$

Thus the matrix $S=MF^*$ is given by:

$$S_{il}=(MF^*)_{il}=\sum_j M_{ij}(F^*)_{jl}=\sum_{jk}w^{(i-k-l)j}P_{ik}=P_{i,i-l}$$

So, we have $P_{ij}=S_{i,i-j}$, and the conditions $P_{ij}=P_{i+j,j}=\bar{P}_{i,-j}$ become:

$$S_{i,i-j}=S_{i+j,i}=\bar{S}_{i,i+j}$$

Now observe that the equality on the right simply tells us that S is self-adjoint. Thus, what is left is the equality on the left, which gives the formula in the statement.

(4) Since W_N is real, so are the corresponding matrices S, and the result follows from (1), because the condition there on S is automatically satisfied. □

Observe that Theorem 2.6 provides a more conceptual proof for the defect formula $d(W_N) = \frac{N(N+1)}{2}$ in Proposition 2.5. As already mentioned, we believe that the inequality $d(H) \leq \frac{N(N+1)}{2}$ should hold in general, but we don't have a proof for this fact.

Let us discuss now some rationality questions:

Definition 2.7. *The rational defect of $H \in C_N$ is the following number:*

$$d_{\mathbb{Q}}(H) = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\widetilde{T}_H C_N \cap M_N(\mathbb{Q}))$$

The vector space on the right will be called rational enveloping tangent space at H.

As a first observation, this notion can be extended to all the tangent cones at H, and by using an arbitrary field $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{C}$ instead of $\mathbb{Q}$. Indeed, we can set:

$$T^*_H C_N(\mathbb{K}) = T^*_H C_N \cap M_N(\mathbb{K})$$

However, in what follows we will be interested only in the objects constructed in Definition 2.7. It follows from definitions that $d_{\mathbb{Q}}(H) \leq d(H)$, and we have:

Conjecture 2.8 (Rationality)**.** *For Butson matrices we have $d_{\mathbb{Q}}(H) = d(H)$.*

In fact, the original statement in [1] is that the above equality should hold in the regular case. However, since the regular case is not known to fully cover the Butson matrix case, as explained in Conjecture 1.6, we prefer to state our conjecture as above.

Let $C_N(s)$ be the set of $N \times N$ complex Hadamard matrices having as entries the s-th roots of unity. With this notation, we have the following elementary result:

Proposition 2.9. *The rationality conjecture holds for $H \in C_N(s)$ with $s = 2, 3, 4, 6$.*

Proof. Let us recall that the equations for the enveloping tangent space are:

$$\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}(A_{ik} - A_{jk}) = 0$$

In the case $s = 2$ these equations are all real, and have rational (± 1) coefficients. In the case $s = 3, 6$ we can use the well-known fact that, with $j = e^{2\pi i/3}$, the real solutions of $x + jy + j^2 z = 0$ are those satisfying $x = y = z$, and we conclude that once again our system, after some manipulations, is equivalent to a real system having rational coefficients. As for the case $s = 4$, here the coefficients are $1, i, -1, -i$, so by taking the real and imaginary parts, we reach once again to system with rational coefficients.

Thus, in all cases under investigation, $s = 2, 3, 4, 6$, we have a real system with rational coefficients, and the result follows from standard linear algebra. $\square$

Observe that the above method cannot work at $s = 5$, where the equation $a + wb + w^2 c + w^3 d + w^4 e = 0$ with $w = e^{2\pi i/5}$ and $a, b, c, d, e \in \mathbb{R}$ can have "exotic" solutions.

We will prove in section 5 that Conjecture 2.8 is verified for the Fourier matrices.

Finally, let us go back to Proposition 2.3, and to the formula $d(H) = |1 \in H|$ found there. We expect this formula to be valid under much more general assumptions:

Problem 2.10. *When does the defect formula* $d(H) = |1 \in H|$ *hold?*

We believe for instance that this formula should hold for matrices of type $H = F_G \otimes_Q F_K$, under fairly general assumptions on the deformation matrix $Q \in M_{N\times M}(\mathbb{T})$. For instance Proposition 3.5 below suggests that the result should hold for Q dephased and elsewhere generic. However, we do not know what the exact assumptions on Q should be.

3. Tensor product gluing

In this section we discuss the computation of the various tangent cones at a tensor product $H \otimes K$. The problem that we are interested in is to determine how the various tangent cones at H, K, from Definition 1.9 above, glue together at $H \otimes K$.

We recall that our tensor product convention is $(H \otimes K)_{ia,jb} = H_{ij}K_{ab}$. In matrix form, by using the lexicographic order on the double indices:

$$H \otimes K = \begin{pmatrix} H_{11}K & \ldots & H_{1N}K \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ H_{N1}K & \ldots & H_{NN}K \end{pmatrix}$$

Let us begin with a elementary result, regarding the enveloping tangent spaces:

Proposition 3.1. *We have* $\widetilde{T}_H C_N \otimes \widetilde{T}_K C_M \subset \widetilde{T}_{H\otimes K} C_{NM}$.

Proof. Indeed, for a matrix $A = B \otimes C$, we have the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{kc} (H \otimes K)_{ia,kc} \overline{(H \otimes K)}_{jb,kc} A_{ia,kc} &= \sum_{kc} H_{ik}K_{ac}\bar{H}_{jk}\bar{K}_{bc}B_{ik}C_{ac} \\ &= \sum_{k} H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}B_{ik} \sum_{c} K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}C_{ac}\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have as well the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{kc} (H \otimes K)_{ia,kc} \overline{(H \otimes K)}_{jb,kc} A_{jb,kc} &= \sum_{kc} H_{ik}K_{ac}\bar{H}_{jk}\bar{K}_{bc}B_{jk}C_{bc} \\ &= \sum_{k} H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}B_{jk} \sum_{c} K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}C_{bc}\end{aligned}$$

Now by assuming $B \in \widetilde{T}_H C_N$ and $C \in \widetilde{T}_K C_M$, the two quantities appearing above on the right are equal. Thus we have indeed $A \in \widetilde{T}_{H\otimes K} C_{NM}$, and we are done. $\square$

In general, it is not clear when the inclusion in Proposition 3.1 is an isomorphism. We refer to [35] and to section 5 below for a number of results in this direction.

In order to further study the tangent cones, let us first review in detail the notion of Diţă deformation, from Proposition 1.4 above. We recall from there that:

$$H\,{}_Q\!\otimes K = (Q_{aj}H_{ij}K_{ab})_{ia,jb}, \qquad H \otimes_Q K = (Q_{ib}H_{ij}K_{ab})_{ia,jb}$$

In matrix notation, by using more convenient lower-case letters for the entries of Q, and by using the lexicographic order on the double indices, we have:

$$H\,{}_Q\!\otimes K=\begin{pmatrix}
q_{11}H_{11}K_{11}\ldots q_{11}H_{11}K_{1M}&\ldots&q_{1N}H_{1N}K_{11}\ldots q_{1N}H_{1N}K_{1M}\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
q_{M1}H_{11}K_{M1}\ldots q_{M1}H_{11}K_{MM}&\ldots&q_{MN}H_{1N}K_{M1}\ldots q_{MN}H_{1N}K_{MM}\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
q_{11}H_{N1}K_{11}\ldots q_{11}H_{N1}K_{1M}&\ldots&q_{1N}H_{NN}K_{11}\ldots q_{1N}H_{NN}K_{1M}\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
q_{M1}H_{N1}K_{M1}\ldots q_{M1}H_{N1}K_{MM}&\ldots&q_{MN}H_{NN}K_{M1}\ldots q_{MN}H_{NN}K_{MM}
\end{pmatrix}$$

As for the right Diţă deformation, the entries here are of course the same as above, but up to a certain permutation. More precisely, the formula is:

$$H\otimes_Q K=\begin{pmatrix}
q_{11}H_{11}K_{11}\ldots q_{1M}H_{11}K_{1M}&\ldots&q_{11}H_{1N}K_{11}\ldots q_{1M}H_{1N}K_{1M}\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
q_{11}H_{11}K_{M1}\ldots q_{1M}H_{11}K_{MM}&\ldots&q_{11}H_{1N}K_{M1}\ldots q_{1M}H_{1N}K_{MM}\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
q_{N1}H_{N1}K_{11}\ldots q_{NM}H_{N1}K_{1M}&\ldots&q_{N1}H_{NN}K_{11}\ldots q_{NM}H_{NN}K_{1M}\\
\ldots&\ldots&\ldots\\
q_{N1}H_{N1}K_{M1}\ldots q_{NM}H_{N1}K_{MM}&\ldots&q_{N1}H_{NN}K_{M1}\ldots q_{NM}H_{NN}K_{MM}
\end{pmatrix}$$

The fact that the entries of the right and left Diţă deformations are the same modulo a permutation is in fact a consequence of the following simple fact:

Proposition 3.2. *We have an equivalence $H\,{}_Q\!\otimes K\simeq K\otimes_Q H$.*

Proof. According to the formulae in Proposition 1.4 above, we have:

$$(H\,{}_Q\!\otimes K)_{ia,jb}=q_{aj}H_{ij}K_{ab}=q_{aj}K_{ab}H_{ij}=(K\otimes_Q H)_{ai,bj}$$

Now since the transformation $M_{ia,jb}\to M_{ai,bj}$ is implemented by certain permutations of the rows and columns, the above two matrices are indeed equivalent. □

Observe now that, if we look at the complex Hadamard matrices modulo the equivalence relation in Definition 1.3, we can always assume that our parameter matrix Q is "dephased", in the sense that its first row and column consist of 1 entries only.

As an illustration here, at $N=M=2$ we have the following result:

Proposition 3.3. *Any Diţă deformation of $F_{2,2}=F_2\otimes F_2$ is equivalent to*

$$F_{2,2}^q=\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{pmatrix}\otimes_{\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\1&q\end{pmatrix}}\begin{pmatrix}1&1\\1&-1\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}1&1&1&1\\1&-1&1&-1\\1&q&-1&-q\\1&-q&-1&q\end{pmatrix}$$

for a certain value of the parameter $q\in\mathbb{T}$*.*

Proof. First, by using Proposition 3.2 we may restrict attention to the case of right Diţă deformations. But here, with $Q=(\begin{smallmatrix}a&c\\b&d\end{smallmatrix})$, our claim is that we have $F_2\otimes_Q F_2\simeq F_{2,2}^q$, with $q=ad/bc$. Indeed, by dephasing our matrix we obtain:

$$\begin{pmatrix}a&b&a&b\\a&-b&a&-b\\c&d&-c&-d\\c&-d&-c&d\end{pmatrix}\simeq\begin{pmatrix}1&1&1&1\\1&-1&1&-1\\\frac{c}{a}&\frac{d}{b}&-\frac{c}{a}&-\frac{d}{b}\\\frac{c}{a}&-\frac{d}{b}&-\frac{c}{a}&\frac{d}{b}\end{pmatrix}\simeq\begin{pmatrix}1&1&1&1\\1&-1&1&-1\\1&\frac{ad}{bc}&-1&-\frac{ad}{bc}\\1&-\frac{ad}{bc}&-1&\frac{ad}{bc}\end{pmatrix}$$

But this means $F_2\otimes_Q F_2\simeq F_{2,2}^q$, with $q=ad/bc$, and this finishes the proof. ☐

Let us discuss now the computation of the various tangent cones for a Diţă deformation. Here we basically have just one result, concerning the case where the deformation matrix is dephased and elsewhere generic, in the following sense:

Definition 3.4. *A rectangular matrix* $Q\in M_{N\times M}(\mathbb{T})$ *is called "dephased and elsewhere generic" if the entries on its first row and column are all equal to* 1*, and the remaining* $(N-1)(M-1)$ *entries are algebraically independent over* $\mathbb{Q}$*.*

Here the last condition takes of course into account the fact that the entries of Q themselves have modulus 1, the independence assumption being modulo this fact.

We have the following result, extending the 4×4 computations in [1]:

Proposition 3.5. *If* $H\in C_N, K\in C_M$ *are dephased, of Butson type, and* $Q\in M_{N\times M}(\mathbb{T})$ *is dephased and elsewhere generic, then* $A=(A_{ia,kc})$ *belongs to* $\widetilde{T}_{H\otimes_Q K}C_{NM}$ *iff*

$$A_{ac}^{ij}=A_{bc}^{ij},\quad A_{ac}^{ij}=\overline{A_{ac}^{ji}},\quad (A_{xy}^{ii})_{xy}\in\widetilde{T}_K C_M$$

hold for any a,b,c *and* $i\neq j$*, where* $A_{ac}^{ij}=\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}A_{ia,kc}$*.*

Proof. Consider the system for the enveloping tangent space, namely:

$$\sum_{kc}(H\otimes K)_{ia,kc}\overline{(H\otimes K)}_{jb,kc}(A_{ia,kc}-A_{jb,kc})=0$$

We have $(H\otimes K)_{ia,jb}=q_{ib}H_{ij}K_{ab}$, and so our system is:

$$\sum_c q_{ic}\bar{q}_{jc}K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}(A_{ia,kc}-A_{jb,kc})=0$$

Consider now the variables $A_{ac}^{ij}=\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}A_{ia,kc}$ in the statement. We have:

$$\overline{A_{ac}^{ij}}=\sum_k\bar{H}_{ik}H_{jk}A_{ia,kc}=\sum_k H_{jk}\bar{H}_{ik}A_{ia,kc}$$

Thus, in terms of these variables, our system becomes simply:

$$\sum_c q_{ic}\bar{q}_{jc}K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}(A_{ac}^{ij}-\overline{A_{bc}^{ji}})=0$$

More precisely, the above equations must hold for any i, j, a, b. By distinguishing now two cases, depending on whether i, j are equal or not, the situation is as follows:

(1) Case $i \neq j$. In this case, let us look at the row vector of parameters, namely:

$$(q_{ic}\bar{q}_{jc})_c = (1, q_{i1}\bar{q}_{j1}, \ldots, q_{iN}\bar{q}_{jN})$$

Now since Q was assumed to be dephased and elsewhere generic, and because of our assumption $i \neq j$, the entries of the above vector are linearly independent over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$. But, since by linear algebra we can restrict attention to the computation of the solutions over $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$, the $i \neq j$ part of our system simply becomes $A_{ac}^{ij} = \overline{A_{bc}^{ji}}$, for any a, b, c and any $i \neq j$. Now by making now a, b, c vary, we are led to the following equations:

$$A_{ac}^{ij} = A_{bc}^{ij}, \quad A_{ac}^{ij} = \overline{A_{ac}^{ji}}, \quad \forall a, b, c, i \neq j$$

(2) Case $i = j$. In this case the parameters cancel, and our equations become:

$$\sum_c K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}(A_{ac}^{ii} - \overline{A_{bc}^{ii}}) = 0, \quad \forall a, b, c, i$$

On the other hand, we have $A_{ac}^{ii} = \sum_k A_{ia,kc}$, and so our equations become:

$$\sum_c K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}(A_{ac}^{ii} - A_{bc}^{ii}) = 0, \quad \forall a, b, c, i$$

But these are precisely the equations for the space $\widetilde{T}_K C_M$, and we are done. □

Let us go back now to the usual tensor product situation, and look at the affine cones. In general, we cannot expect $T_{H\otimes K}^\circ C_{NM}$ to appear from a simple gluing procedure, so the question which makes sense is rather that of finding the biggest subcone of $T_{H\otimes K}^\circ C_{NM}$, obtained by gluing $T_H^\circ C_N, T_K^\circ C_M$. Our answer here, which takes into account the two "semi-trivial" cones coming from the left and right Diţă deformations, is as follows:

Theorem 3.6. *The cones $T_H^\circ C_N = \{B\}$ and $T_K^\circ C_M = \{C\}$ glue via the formulae*

$$A_{ia,jb} = \lambda B_{ij} + \psi_j C_{ab} + X_{ia} + Y_{jb} + F_{aj}$$

$$A_{ia,jb} = \phi_b B_{ij} + \mu C_{ab} + X_{ia} + Y_{jb} + E_{ib}$$

producing in this way two subcones of the affine cone $T_{H\otimes K}^\circ C_{NM} = \{A\}$.

Proof. Indeed, the idea is that X_{ia}, Y_{jb} are the trivial parameters, and that E_{ib}, F_{aj} are the Diţă parameters. In order to prove the result, we use the criterion in Theorem 1.10 (3) above. So, given a matrix $A = (A_{ia,jb})$, consider the following quantity:

$$P = \sum_{kc} H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}q^{A_{ia,kc} - A_{jb,kc}}$$

Let us prove now the first statement, namely that for any choice of matrices $B \in T_H^\circ C_N, C \in T_H^\circ C_M$ and of parameters $\lambda, \psi_j, X_{ia}, Y_{jb}, F_{aj}$, the first matrix $A = (A_{ia,jb})$ constructed in the statement belongs indeed to $T_{H\otimes K}^\circ C_{NM}$. We have:

$$A_{ia,kc} = \lambda B_{ik} + \psi_k C_{ac} + X_{ia} + Y_{kc} + F_{ak}$$
$$A_{jb,kc} = \lambda B_{jk} + \psi_k C_{bc} + X_{jb} + Y_{kc} + F_{bk}$$

Now by substracting, we obtain:

$$A_{ia,kc} - A_{jb,kc} = \lambda(B_{ik} - B_{jk}) + \psi_k(C_{ac} - C_{bc}) + (X_{ia} - X_{jb}) + (F_{ak} - F_{bk})$$

It follows that the above quantity P is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \sum_{kc} H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}q^{\lambda(B_{ik}-B_{jk})+\psi_k(C_{ac}-C_{bc})+(X_{ia}-X_{jb})+(F_{ak}-F_{bk})} \\ &= q^{X_{ia}-X_{jb}}\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}q^{F_{ak}-F_{bk}}q^{\lambda(B_{ik}-B_{jk})}\sum_c K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}(q^{\psi_k})^{C_{ac}-C_{bc}} \\ &= \delta_{ab}q^{X_{ia}-X_{ja}}\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}(q^\lambda)^{B_{ik}-B_{jk}} = \delta_{ab}\delta_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

Thus Theorem 1.10 (3) applies and tells us that we have $A \in T_{H\otimes K}^\circ C_{NM}$, as claimed. In the second case now, the proof is similar. First, we have:

$$A_{ia,kc} = \phi_c B_{ik} + \mu C_{ac} + X_{ia} + Y_{kc} + E_{ic}$$
$$A_{jb,kc} = \phi_c B_{jk} + \mu C_{bc} + X_{jb} + Y_{kc} + E_{jc}$$

Thus by substracting, we obtain:

$$A_{ia,kc} - A_{jb,kc} = \phi_c(B_{ik} - B_{jk}) + \mu(C_{ac} - C_{bc}) + (X_{ia} - X_{jb}) + (E_{ic} - E_{jc})$$

It follows that the above quantity P is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \sum_{kc} H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}q^{\phi_c(B_{ik}-B_{jk})+\mu(C_{ac}-C_{bc})+(X_{ia}-X_{jb})+(E_{ic}-E_{jc})} \\ &= q^{X_{ia}-X_{jb}}\sum_c K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}q^{E_{ic}-E_{jc}}q^{\mu(C_{ac}-C_{bc})}\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}(q^{\phi_c})^{B_{ik}-B_{jk}} \\ &= \delta_{ij}q^{X_{ia}-X_{ib}}\sum_c K_{ac}\bar{K}_{bc}(q^\mu)^{C_{ac}-C_{bc}} = \delta_{ij}\delta_{ab} \end{aligned}$$

Thus Theorem 1.10 (3) applies again, and gives the result. □

We believe Theorem 3.6 above to be "optimal", in the sense that nothing more can be said about the affine tangent space $T_{H\otimes K}^\circ C_{NM}$, in the general case. This claim is supported by various computations for $F_N \otimes F_M$, and by results in [5], [37].

In view of these observations, the following problem appears:

Problem 3.7. *What is the affine cone gluing at an iterated tensor product of complex Hadamard matrices, $H_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes H_n$?*

In principle the answer can be simply obtained here by an iterated application of Theorem 3.6. However, it is not clear how to best formulate the final result.

4. Fourier matrices

In this section and in the next one we study the Fourier matrix F_N, and we state and prove our main result, concerning the enveloping tangent space at F_N.

There is a long story here, going back to Karabegov's paper [22], then to the work of Diţă [13], Tadej-Życzkowski [36], [37], and Barros e Sá and Bengtsson [5]. Our result here improves the previously known facts about $\widetilde{T}_HC_N$, and can be viewed as a complement, or new ingredient, to the current exploration of the tangent cone T_HC_N in [5].

Since the whole subject belongs to a new and somewhat mysterious area of linear algebra, we will give many examples and details. Let us first discuss in detail the isotypic case, where $N = p^a$ is a prime power, following [5], [36]. First, we have:

Proposition 4.1. *For $F = F_p$ with p prime, we have*

$$T_F^\times C_p = T_F^\circ C_p = T_HC_p = \widetilde{T}_FC_p$$

and this space consists of the matrices of type $A_{ij} = a_i + b_j$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

Proof. It is enough to check that we have $T_F^\times C_p = \widetilde{T}_FC_p$, which means that any matrix $A \in \widetilde{T}_FC_p$ should decompose as $A_{ij} = a_i + b_j$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^p$. At $p = 2$ we have:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} a & c \\ b & c \end{pmatrix}, \qquad F^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus the exponent matrices are as follows, with $x + t = y + z$:

$$A = PF^* = \begin{pmatrix} a+c & a-c \\ b+c & b-c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ z & t \end{pmatrix}$$

This gives the result. At $p = 3$ now, with $w = e^{2\pi i/3}$ we have:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} a & z & \bar{z} \\ b & z & \bar{z} \\ c & z & \bar{z} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad F^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & w^2 & w \\ 1 & w & w^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus the exponent matrices have a similar look, and this gives the result:

$$A = PF^* = \begin{pmatrix} a+z+\bar{z} & a+w^2z+w\bar{z} & a+wz+w^2\bar{z} \\ b+z+\bar{z} & b+w^2z+w\bar{z} & b+wz+w^2\bar{z} \\ c+z+\bar{z} & c+w^2z+w\bar{z} & c+wz+w^2\bar{z} \end{pmatrix}$$

In general now, we have $A_{00} + A_{ij} = A_{i0} + A_{0j}$, and this gives the result. □

Observe that Proposition 4.1 is somehow not fully satisfactory, because the fact that the defect is $d(F) = 2p - 1$ is not entirely obvious from it. So, let us improve it:

Proposition 4.2. *For $F = F_p$, the elements $A \in \widetilde{T}_F C_p$ are the solutions of*

$$A_{ij} = L^{00}_{00} + L^{01}_{0j} + L^{10}_{i0}$$

where the L variables are free, with $L^{01}_{0j} = 0$ for $j \neq 0$, and $L^{10}_{i0} = 0$ for $i \neq 0$.

Proof. The claim is that there exist free variables L, such that:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{00} &= L^{00}_{00} \\ A_{0j} &= L^{00}_{00} + L^{01}_{0j} \quad (j \neq 0) \\ A_{i0} &= L^{00}_{00} + L^{10}_{i0} \quad (i \neq 0) \\ A_{ij} &= L^{00}_{00} + L^{01}_{0j} + L^{10}_{i0} \quad (i, j \neq 0) \end{aligned}$$

But this follows from Proposition 4.1, by taking $L^{00}_{00} = A_{00}$, and so on. $\square$

Let us discuss now the case $N = p^2$. We recall that $M^\circ_n(\mathbb{R})$ is by definition the set of real $n \times n$ matrices having 0 on the first row and column. We will need the following key result, regarding the enveloping tangent space to the dephased manifold $C_N \to D_N$:

Proposition 4.3. *For $F = F_{p^2}$ with p prime, we have*

$$\widetilde{T}_F D_N = \{A \in M_N(\mathbb{R}) | \exists M \in M^\circ_p(\mathbb{R}),\ A_{ij} = M_{\bar{i},\bar{j}}\}$$

where $\bar{i}, \bar{j}$ are the reminders of i, j modulo p.

Proof. Let us first work out the case $p = 2$. Here the defect is 8, and:

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} a & z & e & \bar{z} \\ b & z & f & \bar{z} \\ c & z & e & \bar{z} \\ d & z & f & \bar{z} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad F^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -i & -1 & i \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & i & -1 & -i \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus with $z = p + iq$ we obtain the following formula:

$$A = PF^* = \begin{pmatrix} a+e+2p & a-e+2q & a+e-2p & a-e-2q \\ b+f+2p & b-f+2q & b+f-2p & b-f-2q \\ c+e+2p & c-e+2q & c+e-2p & c-e-2q \\ d+f+2p & d-f+2q & d+f-2p & d-f-2q \end{pmatrix}$$

Now by assuming that A is dephased, as in the statement, we obtain that we have $a = c = e = p = q = 0$ and $b = d = -f$, and so our matrix is given by:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2f & 0 & -2f \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2f & 0 & -2f \end{pmatrix}$$

Thus we reach to the conclusion in the statement. At $p=3$ now, we have:

$$A=\begin{pmatrix}a&x&y&u&z&\bar{z}&\bar{u}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ b&x&y&v&z&\bar{z}&\bar{v}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ c&x&y&w&z&\bar{z}&\bar{w}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ d&x&y&u&z&\bar{z}&\bar{u}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ e&x&y&v&z&\bar{z}&\bar{v}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ f&x&y&w&z&\bar{z}&\bar{w}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ g&x&y&u&z&\bar{z}&\bar{u}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ h&x&y&v&z&\bar{z}&\bar{v}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\\ i&x&y&w&z&\bar{z}&\bar{w}&\bar{y}&\bar{x}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\ 1&w^8&w^7&w^6&w^5&w^4&w^3&w^2&w\\ 1&w^7&w^5&w^3&w&w^8&w^6&w^4&w^2\\ 1&w^6&w^3&1&w^6&w^3&1&w^6&w^3\\ 1&w^5&w&w^6&w^2&w^7&w^3&w^8&w^4\\ 1&w^4&w^8&w^3&w^7&w^2&w^6&w&w^5\\ 1&w^3&w^6&1&w^3&w^6&1&w^3&w^6\\ 1&w^2&w^4&w^6&w^8&w&w^3&w^5&w^7\\ 1&w&w^2&w^3&w^4&w^5&w^6&w^7&w^8\end{pmatrix}$$

By assuming now that A is dephased, we obtain the following equations:

$$a=x=y=z=u=0,\quad d=g=0$$

$$b=e=h=-(v+\bar{v}),\quad c=f=i=-(w+\bar{w})$$

Thus with $v=\alpha+i\beta$, $w=\gamma+i\delta$, the dephased matrix A is equal to:

$$\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ -2\alpha&0&0&\alpha+i\beta&0&0&\alpha-i\beta&0&0\\ -2\gamma&0&0&\gamma+i\delta&0&0&\gamma-i\delta&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ -2\alpha&0&0&\alpha+i\beta&0&0&\alpha-i\beta&0&0\\ -2\gamma&0&0&\gamma+i\delta&0&0&\gamma-i\delta&0&0\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ -2\alpha&0&0&\alpha+i\beta&0&0&\alpha-i\beta&0&0\\ -2\gamma&0&0&\gamma+i\delta&0&0&\gamma-i\delta&0&0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1&1\\ 1&w^8&w^7&w^6&w^5&w^4&w^3&w^2&w\\ 1&w^7&w^5&w^3&w&w^8&w^6&w^4&w^2\\ 1&w^6&w^3&1&w^6&w^3&1&w^6&w^3\\ 1&w^5&w&w^6&w^2&w^7&w^3&w^8&w^4\\ 1&w^4&w^8&w^3&w^7&w^2&w^6&w&w^5\\ 1&w^3&w^6&1&w^3&w^6&1&w^3&w^6\\ 1&w^2&w^4&w^6&w^8&w&w^3&w^5&w^7\\ 1&w&w^2&w^3&w^4&w^5&w^6&w^7&w^8\end{pmatrix}$$

Let us introduce now the following variables:

$$x=-3\alpha+(iw^6-iw^3)\beta,\quad y=-3\alpha+(iw^3-iw^6)\beta$$

$$z=-3\gamma+(iw^6-iw^3)\delta,\quad t=-3\gamma+(iw^3-iw^6)\delta$$

Observe that we have in fact $iw^6-iw^3=\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$. In terms of x,y,z,t, we have:

$$A=\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&x&y&0&x&y&0&x&y\\ 0&z&t&0&z&t&0&z&t\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&x&y&0&x&y&0&x&y\\ 0&z&t&0&z&t&0&z&t\\ 0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\ 0&x&y&0&x&y&0&x&y\\ 0&z&t&0&z&t&0&z&t\end{pmatrix}$$

Thus we have reached again to the conclusion in the statement.

The general case similar, because when assuming A to be dephased, we obtain a $p \times p$ block decomposition of A as in the above examples, and this gives the result. For a full proof here, we refer to the proof of Proposition 4.5 below, at $a = 2$. □

Let us add now the trivial deformation part, and reformulate the result a bit as in Proposition 4.2 above. The statement that we obtain is as follows:

Proposition 4.4. *For $F = F_{p^2}$, the elements $A \in \widetilde{T}_F C_N$ are the solutions of*

$$A_{ij} = L^{00}_{00} + L^{01}_{0\bar{j}} + L^{10}_{\bar{i}0} + L^{02}_{0j} + L^{20}_{i0} + L^{11}_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}$$

where the L variables are free, and dephased, and $\bar{i}, \bar{j}$ are the reminders of i, j modulo p.

Proof. By adding trivial deformations to the formula in Proposition 4.3, and then by reparametrizing these trivial deformations as in Proposition 4.2, we get:

$$A_{ij} = \alpha + a_i + b_j + M_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}$$

Here a_i, b_j are free variables, with the conventions $a_i = 0$ for $i \neq 0$, and $b_j = 0$ for $j \neq 0$. Now by using the further splitting of indices modulo p, we can write:

$$A_{ij} = \alpha + \beta_{\bar{i}} + \gamma_{\bar{j}} + \delta_i + \varepsilon_j + M_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}$$

Here $\beta, \gamma, \delta, \varepsilon$ are now dephased, and this gives the formula in the statement. □

We are now in position of stating and proving our main technical result. We say that a matrix L^{rs} over the group $\mathbb{Z}_{p^r} \times \mathbb{Z}_{p^s}$ is dephased if its nonzero entries belong to:

$$X_{rs} = (\mathbb{Z}_{p^r} - \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r-1}}) \times (\mathbb{Z}_{p^s} - \mathbb{Z}_{p^{s-1}})$$

Here, and in what follows, we use the convention $\mathbb{Z}_{p^{-1}} = \emptyset$.

Proposition 4.5. *For $F = F_{p^a}$, the elements $A \in \widetilde{T}_F C_N$ are the solutions of*

$$A_{ij} = \sum_{r+s \leq a} L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i, p^{a-s}j}$$

where the L variables are free, and form dephased matrices L^{rs}.

Proof. Observe first that at $a = 1, 2$ this follows from Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.4 respectively. Observe also that in the general case, the number of L variables is:

$$\begin{aligned} d &= \sum_{r+s \leq a} |\mathbb{Z}_{p^r} - \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r-1}}| \cdot |\mathbb{Z}_{p^s} - \mathbb{Z}_{p^{s-1}}| = \sum_{r \leq a} p^{a-r} |\mathbb{Z}_{p^r} - \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r-1}}| \\ &= p^a + \sum_{r=1}^{a} p^{a-r}(p^r - p^{r-1}) = p^a + a(p-1)p^{a-1} = (p + ap - a)p^{a-1} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the number of L variables equals the defect $d(F)$, so it is indeed the good one. As for the proof now, in the general case, this is quite similar to the one at $a = 1, 2$.

More precisely, consider the map $L\to A$. This map is linear, and in view of the above calculation, it is enough to prove that this map is injective, and has the correct target.

For the injectivity part, recall that at $a=2$ the formula in the statement reads:

$$A_{ij}=L^{00}_{00}+L^{01}_{0,pj}+L^{10}_{pi,0}+L^{02}_{0j}+L^{20}_{i0}+L^{11}_{pi,pj}$$

Now assume $A=0$. Then with $i=j=0$ we get $L^{00}_{00}=0$. Using this, with $i=0$ and $pj=0,j\neq 0$ we get $L^{00}_{00}+L^{02}_{0j}=0$, and so $L^{02}_{0j}=0$. So, with $i=0$ and $pj\neq 0$ we therefore obtain $L^{00}_{00}+L^{02}_{0j}+L^{01}_{0,pj}=0$, and so $L^{01}_{0,pj}=0$. Now the same method gives as well succesively $L^{20}_{i0}=0$ and $L^{10}_{pi,0}=0$, so we are left with $A_{ij}=L^{11}_{pi,pj}$, so we must have $L^{11}_{pi,pj}=0$ as well, and we are done. This method works of course for any $a\in\mathbb N$.

Regarding now the "target" part, we must prove $A\in\widetilde{T}_FC_N$. The equations are:

$$\sum_kw^{(i-j)k}\left(\sum_{r+s\leq a}L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}k}-L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}j,p^{a-s}k}\right)=0$$

So, for any indices i,j and any $r+s\leq a$, we must prove that we have:

$$\sum_kw^{(i-j)k}\left(L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}k}-L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}j,p^{a-s}k}\right)=0$$

In order to do this, consider the following quantity:

$$X_{il}=\frac{1}{p^a}\sum_kw^{lk}L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}k}$$

We must prove $X_{i,i-j}=X_{j,i-j}$. But, with $k=m+p^sn$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}X_{il}&=\frac{1}{p^a}\sum_{mn}w^{l(m+p^sn)}L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}m}\\&=\frac{1}{p^a}\sum_nw^{lp^sn}\sum_mw^{lm}L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}m}\\&=\delta_{l0}\sum_mw^{lm}L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}m}\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $l\neq 0\implies X_{il}=0$, and so $X_{i,i-j}=X_{j,i-j}$ and we are done. □

Let us discuss now the affine deformations:

Proposition 4.6. *If $N=p^a$, the defect of F_N is exhausted by affine deformations.*

Proof. With $k = m + p^s n$, as in the proof of Proposition 4.5 above, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_k H_{ik}\bar{H}_{jk}q^{A_{ik}-A_{jk}} &= \sum_k w^{(i-j)k}\prod_{r+s\leq a} q^{L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}k}-L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}j,p^{a-s}k}}\\ &= \sum_n w^{(i-j)p^s n}\sum_m w^{(i-j)m}\prod_{r+s\leq a} q^{L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}m}-L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}j,p^{a-s}m}}\\ &= \delta_{ij}p^a\sum_m w^{(i-j)m}\prod_{r+s\leq a} q^{L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}m}-L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}j,p^{a-s}m}}\end{aligned}$$

Now since this quantity vanishes for $i \neq j$, this gives the result. ☐

Finally, let us collect all the above results into a single one:

Theorem 4.7. *For an isotypic Fourier matrix, $H = F_N$ with $N = p^a$, we have*

$$T_H^\circ C_N = T_H C_N = \widetilde{T}_H C_N = \left\{A \in M_N(\mathbb{R})\middle| A_{ij} = \sum_{r+s\leq a} L^{rs}_{p^{a-r}i,p^{a-s}j}\right\}$$

where the L variables are free, and form dephased matrices L^{rs}.

Proof. This follows indeed from Proposition 4.5 and Proposition 4.6. ☐

Observe that this result shows that Conjecture 2.8 holds for the isotypic Fourier matrices. We will see in the next section that the same happens for any Fourier matrix.

5. The general case

In this section we discuss the computation of the enveloping tangent space $\widetilde{T}_H C_N$ in the general case, where $H = F_N$ is an arbitrary Fourier matrix. We will need:

Lemma 5.1. *If $G = H \times K$ is such that $(|H|, |K|) = 1$, the canonical inclusion*

$$\widetilde{T}_{F_H} C_{|H|} \otimes \widetilde{T}_{F_K} C_{|K|} \subset \widetilde{T}_{F_G} C_{|G|}$$

constructed in Proposition 3.1 above is an isomorphism.

Proof. We have $F_G = F_{H\times K}$, and the defect of this matrix is given by:

$$d(F_{H\times K}) = \sum_{(h,k)\in H\times K}\frac{|H\times K|}{ord(h,k)} = \sum_{(h,k)\in H\times K}\frac{|H\times K|}{ord(h)ord(k)} = d(F_H)d(F_K)$$

Thus the inclusion in the statement must be indeed an isomorphism. ☐

With this lemma in hand, the idea now will be simply to "glue" the various isotypic formulae coming from Theorem 4.7. Indeed, let us recall from there that in the isotypic case, $N = p^a$, the parameter set for the enveloping tangent space is:

$$X(p^a) = \bigsqcup_{r+s\leq a} (\mathbb{Z}_{p^r} - \mathbb{Z}_{p^{r-1}}) \times (\mathbb{Z}_{p^s} - \mathbb{Z}_{p^{s-1}})$$

Now since the defect is multiplicative over isotypic components, the parameter set in the general case, $N = p_1^{a_1}\ldots p_k^{a_k}$, will be simply given by:

$$X(p_1^{a_1}\ldots p_k^{a_k}) = X(p_1^{a_1}) \times \ldots \times X(p_k^{a_k})$$

One can obtain from this an even simpler description of the parameter set, just by expanding the product, and gluing the group components. Indeed:

Definition 5.2. *Given a finite abelian group $G = \mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{r_1}} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_k^{r_k}}$ we set:*

$$G^\circ = (\mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{r_1}} - \mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{r_1-1}}) \times \ldots \times (\mathbb{Z}_{p_k^{r_k}} - \mathbb{Z}_{p_k^{r_k-1}})$$

A matrix $L \in M_{G\times H}(\mathbb{R})$ will be called dephased if $L_{ij} = 0$ for any $(i,j) \notin G^\circ \times H^\circ$.

Observe now that, with the above notation G°, the parameter set discussed above is given by the following simple formula:

$$X(N) = \bigsqcup_{G\times H\subset\mathbb{Z}_N} G^\circ \times H^\circ$$

In addition, we can see that the collection of dephased matrices $L \in M_{G\times H}(\mathbb{R})$, over all possible configurations $G \times H \subset \mathbb{Z}_N$, takes its parameters precisely in $X(N)$.

In order to formulate our main result, we will need one more definition:

Definition 5.3. *Given $N = p_1^{a_1}\ldots p_k^{a_k}$ and a subgroup $G \subset \mathbb{Z}_N$, we set*

$$\varphi_G(i_1,\ldots,i_k) = (p_1^{a_1-r_1}i_1,\ldots p_k^{a_k-r_k}i_k)$$

where the exponents $r_i \leq a_i$ are given by $G = \mathbb{Z}_{p_1^{r_1}} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{Z}_{p_k^{r_k}}$.

Observe that in the case $k = 1$ this function is precisely the one appearing in Theorem 4.7 above. In fact, we have the following generalization of Theorem 4.7:

Theorem 5.4. *For $H = F_N$ the vectors $A \in \widetilde{T}_H C_N$ appear as sums of type*

$$A_{ij} = \sum_{G\times H\subset\mathbb{Z}_N} L^{GH}_{\varphi_G(i)\varphi_H(j)}$$

where the L variables are free, and form dephased matrices $L^{GH} \in M_{G\times H}(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. According to the above discussion, we just have to glue the various isotypic formulae coming from Theorem 4.7, by using Lemma 5.1. The gluing formula reads:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{i_1\ldots i_k,j_1\ldots j_k} &= A_{i_1j_1}\ldots A_{i_kj_k}\\
&= \left(\sum_{r_1+s_1\leq a_1} L^{r_1s_1p_1}_{p_1^{a_1-r_1}i_1,p_1^{a_1-s_1}j_1}\cdots\sum_{r_k+s_k\leq a_k} L^{r_ks_kp_k}_{p_k^{a_k-r_k}i_k,p_k^{a_k-s_k}j_k}\right)\\
&= \sum_{r_1+s_1\leq a_1}\cdots\sum_{r_k+s_k\leq a_k} L^{r_1s_1p_1}_{p_1^{a_1-r_1}i_1,p_1^{a_1-s_1}j_1}\cdots L^{r_ks_kp_k}_{p_k^{a_k-r_k}i_k,p_k^{a_k-s_k}j_k}
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let us introduce the following variables:

$$L^{r_1\ldots r_k,s_1\ldots s_k}_{i_1\ldots i_k,j_1\ldots j_k}=L^{r_1s_1}_{i_1j_1}\ldots L^{r_ks_k}_{i_kj_k}$$

In terms of these new variables, the gluing formula reads:

$$A_{i_1\ldots i_k,j_1\ldots j_k}=\sum_{r_1+s_1\leq a_1}\ldots\sum_{r_k+s_k\leq a_k}L^{r_1\ldots r_k,s_1\ldots s_k}_{p_1^{a_1-r_1}i_1,\ldots p_k^{a_k-r_k}i_k,p_1^{a_1-r_1}j_1\ldots p_k^{a_k-r_k}j_k}$$

Now since the new L variables are obtained from the old L variables via a tensor product gluing, they are independent as well. Together with the fact that these variables form dephased matrices, in the sense of Definition 5.2 above, this gives the result. $\square$

Corollary 5.5. *The rationality conjecture holds for the Fourier matrices.*

Proof. Indeed, the formula in Theorem 5.4 shows that for $H=F_N$ the rational defect, as constructed in Definition 2.7, counts the same variables as the usual defect. $\square$

A few comments now regarding the generalized Fourier matrix case, $F=F_G$. In the isotypic case $G=\mathbb{Z}_{p^{a_1}}\times\ldots\times\mathbb{Z}_{p^{a_k}}$, according to Proposition 2.3 (2), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}d(F_G)&=\sum_{g\in G}\frac{N}{ord(g)}=\sum_{(g_1,\ldots,g_k)\in G}\frac{N}{\max(ord(g_1),\ldots,ord(g_k))}\\&=\sum_{r_1=0}^{a_1}\ldots\sum_{r_k=0}^{a_k}|\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r_1}}-\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r_1-1}}|\ldots|\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r_k}}-\mathbb{Z}_{p^{r_k-1}}|\cdot\frac{p^{a_1+\ldots+a_k}}{p^{\max(r_1,\ldots,r_k)}}\end{aligned}$$

The combinatorics here is obviously much more complicated. In fact, if we assume $a_1\leq a_2\leq\ldots\leq a_k$ then the defect formula from [1], that we believe optimal, is:

$$d(F_G)=N\left(1+\sum_{r=1}^{r}p^{(k-r)a_{r-1}+(a_1+\ldots+a_{r-1})-1}(p^{k-r+1}-1)[a_r-a_{r-1}]_{p^{k-r}}\right)$$

Here $a_0=0$, and we use the standard notation $[a]_q=1+q+q^2+\ldots+q^{a-1}$.

As a conclusion, the following problem is open:

Problem 5.6. *How does $\widetilde{T}_FC_N$ decompose, for a generalized Fourier matrix $F=F_G$?*

Regarding now the affine tangent cone $T_F^\circ C_N$, we believe that, at least in the $G=\mathbb{Z}_N$ case, an iterated application of Theorem 3.6 should give the answer, but we don't have a proof for this fact. As for the tangent cone T_FC_N, very little is known here, see [5].

Finally, in the general Butson matrix case, one technical problem comes from the regularity conjecture in [2], mentioned in section 1 above. Indeed, a finer version of this conjecture would be that the regular complex Hadamard matrices are exactly the affine deformations of the Butson matrices, and this is of course very related to the present considerations. We intend to come back to these questions in some future work.

6. Probabilistic aspects

We have seen in the previous sections that for certain complex Hadamard matrices the defect is the number of 1 entries, and the geometry basically comes from this.

In general, the situation is of course much more complicated than that. One problem with the formula $d(H)=|1\in H|$ comes from the fact that the defect is insensitive to the equivalence relation in Definition 1.3, while the number of 1 entries is highly sensitive to it. So, unless H is given to us in some natural, standard form, as is the case for instance with the Fourier matrices, we have to take into account all the quantities of type $|1\in\widetilde{H}|$, with $\widetilde{H}$ ranging over matrices which are equivalent to H.

With this observation in mind, here is a first conjecture:

Conjecture 6.1. *We have the estimate $d(H)\leq\max|1\in\widetilde{H}|$, with the max ranging over all matrices $\widetilde{H}$ which are equivalent to H.*

Let us try now to formulate a finer version of this conjecture, roughly stating that "$d(H)$ can be recaptured from the statistics of $|1\in\widetilde{H}|$, over the matrices $\widetilde{H}\simeq H$".

There is an obvious problem with this latter statement, coming from the fact that the number $|1\in\widetilde{H}|$ is generically equal to 0. In order to overcome this issue, one idea is to restrict attention to the Butson matrices, and to allow in Definition 1.3 only the multiplication on rows and columns by the corresponding roots of unity.

More precisely, let us denote $\mathbb{Z}_s$ the group of s-th roots of unity, and by $C_N(s)$ the set of $N\times N$ complex Hadamard matrices having entries in $\mathbb{Z}_s$. We have then:

Conjecture 6.2. *For $H\in C_N(s)$, with $s\in\mathbb{N}$ chosen to be minimal, we have*

$$\min_{\widetilde{H}\simeq H}|1\in\widetilde{H}|\leq d(H)\leq\max_{\widetilde{H}\simeq H}|1\in\widetilde{H}|$$

with the min/max ranging over matrices of type $\widetilde{H}_{ij}=a_ib_jH_{ij}$, with $a_i,b_j\in\mathbb{Z}_s$.

Observe that in this statement we have dropped the action of the symmetric group on the rows and columns of H, because this action leaves invariant both the defect and the number of 1 entries. As for the assumption that $s\in\mathbb{N}$ has to be minimal, this is of course in order for the lower bound to be non-trivial, because at $s>>0$ this minimum is 0.

Once again, it is not clear on how to approach this kind of statement, so instead of doing so, we will rather try now to further build on it, with some finer speculations and conjectures. So, let us go back to the comment following Conjecture 6.1. The quite vague statement formulated there can be now given a precise meaning, by using:

Definition 6.3. *Let $H\in C_N(s)$ be a Butson matrix.*

1. *We define $\varphi:\mathbb{Z}_s^N\times\mathbb{Z}_s^N\to\mathbb{N}$ by $\varphi(a,b)=\#\{(i,j)|a_ib_jH_{ij}=1\}$.*
2. *We let μ be the probability measure on $\mathbb{N}$ given by $\mu(\{k\})=P(\varphi=k)$.*

In this definition P denotes the probability with respect to the uniform measure on the group $\mathbb{Z}_s^N \times \mathbb{Z}_s^N$. In other words, we regard φ as a random variable over this group, and we denote by μ the distribution of this random variable:

$$\mu(\{k\}) = \frac{1}{s^{2N}} \# \left\{ (a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}_s^N \times \mathbb{Z}_s^N \middle| \varphi(a,b) = k \right\}$$

As a first observation, Conjecture 6.2 above can be reformulated as follows:

Conjecture 6.4. *For $H \in C_N(s)$, with $s \in \mathbb{N}$ chosen to be minimal, we have*

$$d(H) \in supp(\mu)$$

where the measure μ is the one constructed in Definition 6.3 above.

Indeed, the fact that this statement is equivalent to Conjecture 6.2 follows from the fact that the image of the map φ constructed in Definition 6.3 consists exactly of the quantities $|1 \in \widetilde{H}|$ used in the formulation of Conjecture 6.2.

Summarizing, we have reached to a quite conceptual reformulation and generalization of our very first statement, Conjecture 6.1 above, at least in the Butson matrix case.

We will be back in a moment to this support problematics. But, let us formulate now yet another statement, which is our main conjecture on the subject:

Conjecture 6.5 (Main conjecture)**.** *For $H \in C_N(s)$, with $s \in \mathbb{N}$ chosen to be minimal, $d(H)$ can be recaptured from the knowledge of the associated measure μ.*

As a first observation, this doesn't exactly generalize Conjecture 6.4. However, it is hard to imagine that a proof of this conjecture won't solve as well Conjecture 6.4.

In order to further comment on this conjecture, let us first do some computations. The very first problem concerns of course the support of μ, and we have here:

Proposition 6.6. *The support of μ, with $s \in \mathbb{N}$ chosen to be minimal, is as follows:*

1. *For F_2 we get* $\{1, 3\}$.
2. *For F_3 we get* $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$.
3. *For F_4 we get* $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$.
4. *For $F_{2,2}$ we get* $\{4, 6, 8, 10, 12\}$.
5. *For F_5 we get* $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\}$.

Proof. Here is the proof for F_4, in logarithmic form, with the operations being those in Definition 1.3, and with the subscripts denoting the total number of 0 entries:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0&0&0&0\\ 0&1&2&3\\ 0&2&0&2\\ 0&3&2&1 \end{pmatrix}_8 \to \begin{pmatrix} 1&1&1&1\\ 0&1&2&3\\ 0&2&0&2\\ 0&3&2&1 \end{pmatrix}_4 \to \begin{pmatrix} 2&1&1&1\\ 1&1&2&3\\ 1&2&0&2\\ 1&3&2&1 \end{pmatrix}_1$$

$$\to\begin{pmatrix}2&1&2&1\\1&1&3&3\\1&2&1&2\\1&3&3&1\end{pmatrix}_0\to\begin{pmatrix}2&1&2&0\\1&1&3&2\\1&2&1&1\\1&3&3&0\end{pmatrix}_2\to\begin{pmatrix}0&1&2&0\\3&1&3&2\\3&2&1&1\\3&3&3&0\end{pmatrix}_3$$

$$\to\begin{pmatrix}0&0&2&0\\3&0&3&2\\3&1&1&1\\3&2&3&0\end{pmatrix}_5\to\begin{pmatrix}0&0&0&0\\3&0&1&2\\3&1&3&1\\3&2&1&0\end{pmatrix}_6\to\begin{pmatrix}0&0&3&0\\3&0&0&2\\3&1&2&1\\3&2&0&0\end{pmatrix}_7$$

The proof for the other matrices in the statement is similar. □

Observe that Proposition 6.6 supports of course Conjecture 6.4, and that, in addition, it tells us many other things. Probably the most obvious one is that, in all the cases under consideration, the support is an arithmetic progression. We do not know how to prove this statement, so we would like to formulate this as a problem:

Problem 6.7. *Is it true that, for $H \in C_N(s)$, with $s \in \mathbb{N}$ chosen to be minimal, the support of μ is always an arithmetic progression?*

Our first comment here is that the assumption that s is minimal cannot be dropped. Indeed, if we consider the matrix $F_{2,2}$ as an element of $C_4(4)$, and construct the measure μ as in Definition 6.3, by using this exponent $s = 4$, the support that we obtain is:

$$supp(\mu) = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12\}$$

This can be indeed proved by proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 6.6. Now, observe that 11 is missing! So, we really need to assume that s is minimal.

Let us try now to understand what happens at $s = 2$. Here we have:

Proposition 6.8. *Let $H \in C_N(2)$ with $N > 2$, and $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ be the support of μ.*

1. $S \subset 2\mathbb{N}$.
2. $S \subset [\frac{N^2}{4}, \frac{3N^2}{4}]$.
3. *S is symmetric with respect to $N^2/2$.*

Proof. Since we have $N > 2$, we know that $4|N$.

(1) Let r_i, c_i be the number of 1 entries on the rows and columns of H, so that we have $|1 \in H| = \sum r_i = \sum c_i$. From the orthogonality condition for the rows and columns we see that the numbers r_i have the same parity, and that the numbers c_i have as well the same partity. Indeed, let $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N}$ be the lengts of the blocks in two distinct rows:

$$\begin{pmatrix}1&1&-1&-1\\1&-1&1&-1\end{pmatrix}$$

We have then $a + d = b + c = N/2$ and $a + b = r_i, a + c = r_j$, and since $N/2$ is even, we conclude that modulo 2 we have $r_i - r_j = b - c = b + c = 0$, as claimed.

Now since $\sum r_i$ is a sum of N numbers having the same partity, the result follows.

(2) We pick two arbitrary rows of our matrix, say rows i,j, and use the study in (1). Since we have $c_i = a+b$ and $c_j = a+d$ we obtain:

$$\frac{c_i+c_j}{2} = a + \frac{b+c}{2} = a + \frac{N}{4} \in \left[\frac{N}{4}, \frac{3N}{4}\right]$$

Now by averaging over all possible values of $i \neq j$, this gives the result.

(3) This follows by switching signs over all the matrix. $\square$

Observe that Proposition 6.8 is in fact very far from Problem 6.7. In fact, it is not even clear how to solve Problem 6.7 in the case of the Walsh matrices, and we have:

Problem 6.9. *What is supp(μ) for a Walsh matrix, W_N with $N = 2^k$?*

According to the above results, at $N = 2$ we have *supp*$(\mu) = \{1, 3\}$, and at $N = 4$ we have *supp*$(\mu) = \{4, 6, 8, 10, 12\}$. It is also quite elementary to prove that at $N = 8$ we have *supp*$(\mu) = \{22, 24, \ldots, 40, 42\}$. In general, we do not know the answer.

Let us discuss now the computation of the measure μ itself. This appears to be a quite difficult task, and we have here only two results. The first one concerns the Fourier matrix F_2. Here it is easy to see that μ is uniformly distributed on $\{1, 3\}$:

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_1 + \delta_3)$$

However, in view of the all the above issues with the minimality of s, it is perhaps interesting to see what happens for F_2, at other values of s. And our result here is:

Proposition 6.10. *For $F_2 \in C_2(s)$ with s even we have*

$$\mu = 4\rho^{*3} - 6\rho^{*2} + 4\rho - \delta_0$$

where $\rho = \frac{s-1}{s}\delta_0 + \frac{1}{s}\delta_1$ is the rescaled spectral measure of the main character of $\mathbb{Z}_s$.

Proof. We use the logarithmic writing. Consider the following matrix:

$$\widetilde{F}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} i+a & i+b \\ j+a & j+b+1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Here the numbers i, j, a, b range in the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, s-1\}$, and are taken modulo s. What we have to do is to examine the number of 0 entries of $\widetilde{F}_2$, and compute the corresponding probability distribution μ, which is supported on $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.

A straightforward computation here gives the following formula:

$$\mu = \frac{1}{s^3}((s^3 - 4s^2 + 6s - 4)\delta_0 + (4s^2 - 12s + 12)\delta_1 + (6s - 12)\delta_2 + 4\delta_3)$$

But this is the formula in the statement, and we are done. $\square$

Summarizing, we have a complete picture of what happens for the first Walsh matrix, $W_2 = F_2$. Our second result concerns the second Walsh matrix, $W_4 = F_{2,2}$. Here the computation at $s \in 2\mathbb{N}$ arbitrary looks quite complicated, but at $s = 2$ we have:

Proposition 6.11. *For the second Walsh matrix, $F_{2,2} \in C_4(2)$, we have:*

$$\mu = \frac{1}{32}(\delta_4 + 12\delta_6 + 6\delta_8 + 12\delta_{10} + \delta_{12})$$

Proof. It is technically convenient to use the equivalence $F_{2,2} \simeq K_4$, where the matrix K_4 is the one having -1 on the diagonal and 1 elsewhere. Let us perturb now this latter matrix, as in Definition 6.3. In logarithmic notation, we have:

$$(\widetilde{K}_4)_{ij} = a_i + b_j + \delta_{ij}$$

Thus if we want to compute the number of 1 entries, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |1 \in \widetilde{K}_4| &= \#\{(i,j)|i \neq j, a_i = b_j\} + \#\{(i,j)|i = j, a_i \neq b_j\} \\ &= \#\{(i,j)|i \neq j, a_i = b_j\} + \#\{i|a_i \neq b_i\} \\ &= \#\{(i,j)|a_i = b_j\} - \#\{i|a_i = b_i\} + \#\{i|a_i \neq b_i\} \\ &= \#\{(i,j)|a_i = b_j\} + 4 - 2\#\{i|a_i = b_i\} \end{aligned}$$

Now by writing the 16×16 tables for the two quantities appearing on the right, then making the above linear operation above, we obtain the explicit 16×16 table of the values of φ, and counting these values leads to the measure in the statement. □

Observe that for $H \in C_N(2)$, computing the upper edge of the support of μ is the same as solving the corresponding Gale-Berlekamp game [14], [33]. So, we have:

Problem 6.12 (Gale-Berlekamp game)**.** *Given a Butson matrix $H \in C_N(s)$, consider the matrices $\widetilde{H}$ obtained from it by multiplying the rows and columns by roots of unity of order s. What is the maximal number of* 1 *entries, over all these matrices $\widetilde{H}$?*

In fact, the questions raised in the present section are related as well to the various algebraic or analytic problems regarding the 0-1 matrices, cf. [11], [29], [39].

Regarding now the fundamental quantum algebra/algebraic geometry problem mentioned in the introduction, the previous considerations on [1], involving quantum groups and Diaconis-Shahshahani type variables [12], are still waiting to be explored.

However, in view of the results found here, we believe that a better problem, at least for the moment, would be that consisting in connecting the above-mentioned Gale-Berlekamp type game to Jones' spin model problematics [19], [20], [21]. Indeed, the spin model problem is very related to the count of the 1 entries of the tensor powers $H^{\otimes k}$, and so can be regarded as "higher level" version of the Gale-Berlekamp type game.

We intend to further explore this point of view in some future work.

References

[1] T. Banica, The defect of generalized Fourier matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.*, to appear.

[2] T. Banica, J. Bichon and J.-M. Schlenker, Representations of quantum permutation algebras, *J. Funct. Anal.* **257** (2009), 2864–2910.

[3] T. Banica, I. Nechita and J.-M. Schlenker, Analytic aspects of the circulant Hadamard conjecture, `arxiv:1212.3589`.

[4] T. Banica, I. Nechita and K. Życzkowski, Almost Hadamard matrices: general theory and examples, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **19** (2012), 1–26.

[5] N. Barros e Sá and I. Bengtsson, Families of complex Hadamard matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **438** (2013), 2929–2957.

[6] K. Beauchamp and R. Nicoara, Orthogonal maximal abelian $*$-subalgebras of the 6×6 matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **428** (2008), 1833–1853.

[7] I. Bengtsson, W. Bruzda, Å. Ericsson, J.-Å. Larsson, W. Tadej and K. Życzkowski, Mutually unbiased bases and Hadamard matrices of order six, *J. Math. Phys.* **48** (2007), 1–33.

[8] G. Björck, Functions of modulus 1 on Z_n whose Fourier transforms have constant modulus, and cyclic n-roots, *NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci.* **315** (1990), 131–140.

[9] R.D. Burstein, Group-type subfactors and Hadamard matrices, `arxiv:0811.1265`.

[10] A.T. Butson, Generalized Hadamard matrices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **13** (1962), 894–898.

[11] R. Craigen, The range of the determinant function on the set of $n \times n$ (0,1)-matrices, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **8** (1990) 161–171.

[12] P. Diaconis and M. Shahshahani, On the eigenvalues of random matrices, *J. Applied Probab.* **31** (1994), 49–62.

[13] P. Diţă, Some results on the parametrization of complex Hadamard matrices, *J. Phys. A* **37** (2004), 5355–5374.

[14] P.C. Fishburn and N.J.A. Sloane, The solution to Berlekamp's switching game, *Discrete Math.* **74** (1989), 263–290.

[15] U. Haagerup, Orthogonal maximal abelian $*$-subalgebras of the $n \times n$ matrices and cyclic n-roots, in "Operator algebras and quantum field theory", International Press (1997), 296–323.

[16] U. Haagerup, Cyclic p-roots of prime lengths p and related complex Hadamard matrices, `arxiv:0803.2629`.

[17] P. de la Harpe and V.F.R. Jones, Paires de sous-algèbres semi-simples et graphes fortement réguliers, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I. Math.* **311** (1990), 147–150.

[18] K.J. Horadam, Hadamard matrices and their applications, Princeton Univ. Press (2007).

[19] V.F.R. Jones, On knot invariants related to some statistical mechanical models, *Pacific J. Math.* **137** (1989), 311–334.

[20] V.F.R. Jones, Planar algebras I, `arxiv:math.QA/9909027`.

[21] V.F.R. Jones and V.S. Sunder, Introduction to subfactors, Cambridge Univ. Press (1997).

[22] A. Karabegov, The reconstruction of a unitary matrix from the moduli of its elements and symbols on a finite phase space, YERPHI preprint (1989).

[23] B.R. Karlsson, Three-parameter complex Hadamard matrices of order 6, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **434** (2011), 247–258.

[24] T.Y. Lam and K.H. Leung, On vanishing sums of roots of unity, *J. Algebra* **224** (2000), 91–109.

[25] W. de Launey, On the non-existence of generalized weighing matrices, *Ars Combin.* **17** (1984), 117–132.

[26] W. de Launey and D. Flannery, Algebraic design theory, AMS (2011).

[27] K.H. Leung and B. Schmidt, New restrictions on possible orders of circulant Hadamard matrices, *Des. Codes Cryptogr.* **64** (2012), 143–151.

[28] A. Munemasa and Y. Watatani, Orthogonal pairs of $*$-subalgebras and association schemes, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I. Math.* **314** (1992), 329–331.

[29] M.G. Neubauer and A.J. Radcliffe, The maximum determinant of ±1 matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **257** (1997), 289–306.

[30] R. Nicoara, A finiteness result for commuting squares of matrix algebras, *J. Operator Theory* **55** (2006), 295–310.

[31] R. Nicoara, Subfactors and Hadamard matrices, *J. Operator Theory* **64** (2010), 453–468.

[32] S. Popa, Orthogonal pairs of $*$-subalgebras in finite von Neumann algebras, *J. Operator Theory* **9** (1983), 253–268.

[33] R. Roth and K. Viswanathan, On the hardness of decoding the Gale-Berlekamp code, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* **54** (2008), 1050–1060.

[34] F. Szöllősi, A two-parameter family of complex Hadamard matrices of order 6 induced by hypocycloids, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **138** (2010), 921–928.

[35] W. Tadej, Defect of a Kronecker product of unitary matrices, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **436** (2012), 1924–1959.

[36] W. Tadej and K. Życzkowski, A concise guide to complex Hadamard matrices, *Open Syst. Inf. Dyn.* **13** (2006), 133–177.

[37] W. Tadej and K. Życzkowski, Defect of a unitary matrix, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **429** (2008), 447–481.

[38] T. Tao, Fuglede's conjecture is false in 5 and higher dimensions, *Math. Res. Lett.* **11** (2004), 251–258.

[39] T. Tao and V. Vu, On random ±1 matrices: singularity and determinant, *Random Structures Algorithms* **28** (2006), 1–23.

[40] R.F. Werner, All teleportation and dense coding schemes, *J. Phys. A* **34** (2001), 7081–7094.

T.B.: Department of Mathematics, Cergy-Pontoise University, 95000 Cergy-Pontoise, France. `teodor.banica@u-cergy.fr`